

A SELECTIVE SUMMARY OF THE BOOK "ON THE THRESHOLD OF ..."

"On the Threshold of ..." is, among other things, a fresh introduction to the philosophy of normative science, social causality, political philosophy, international relations, and contemporary human life. Part 3, the last and largest part of the book, includes some of the most challenging (nonviolent) radical proposals ever expounded. In Part 1, I offer conjectures, hypotheses, and suggestions, trying to establish what I call 'the science of problem-solving'. A fundamental premise of the book is this: The only scientifically incontestable way to label an event or a phenomenon as a problem is to causally tie it to the 'complaint(s)' it causes in the brain of a sentient being, a process that the sentient being finds unpleasant. I also hypothesize that 'ought not' cannot be separated from the 'is' of the perception of an event that causes suffering. How (or whether) that 'ought not' is produced by the brain may be unknown; but the suffering, without needing speculations or settlement of philosophical disputes, creates too strong a demand to be ignored: The elimination of the cause of suffering, and/or the prevention of the likelihood of suffering or of death. (Thus, an 'ought' is produced from an 'is'. Even though a clear remedy proposal has not been advanced, the ought statement may still read: "Eliminate or alleviate the problem.") Conscious of (some of) its possible implications, I maintain in Part 1 that problems can be defined only for individuals. Hence, they can be said to be solved only in reference to the changes in the bodies of those who originally complained about them, or were thought to be likely to complain about them.

As the preliminary contributions to the science of problem-solving, I conjecture about the causality involved in the perception of problems, the methods that can break that causal chain of events and the technical, social, and political difficulties that await individuals' attempts to solve their own problems. However hopeful I may be of the repercussions of the tentative conjectures in Part 1, I never expected to create, in my own right, a mature science. In fact, I try to argue for what I think to be a new conception of science. I believe that science can show us the possibility and necessity to make use not only of existing knowledge, but also of *the absence of knowledge*. I oppose the notion that science can provide any supraindividual teleological purposes (such as "The more the knowledge, and the more the fields in which knowledge is applied the better."). What may justify science is its service to those who exploit its method. As such an instrument, science can have one other major function in addition to the methodological realization of human ends: To conduct methodological 'maneuvers' to eliminate/escape the external conditions that force human beings to additional risks due to the use of insufficient knowledge, untried methods, and/or by involvement in actions clearly against the interests of some human beings. Therefore, science can be advanced by opposing unjustifiable and too risky applications of knowledge (or simply of prejudices and superstitions). Opposition to nuclear weapons, nuclear technology, genetic engineering, use of untried or unsafe chemical and biological agents can, in that sense, bring advances to the practice of science. 'Scientific' ways of securing human

interests certainly have to include ways of reorganizing social life in such a way that socially-created risks are minimized.

In accordance with that conception of science, I argue that neither the state nor an elite of scientists can be justified in forming/maintaining a monopoly of problem-solving. Problems are both subjective and transitive. For these reasons, and because it is almost impossible to calculate the cost of proposed remedies, it is individuals who should be guaranteed the right to take their own risks. However, (in addition to the technical and official/political obstacles) there are two important categories of social obstacles to problem-solving. One is that problems suffered in social life are *relative*, i.e., that the elimination of an event that displeases some people will cause suffering to some others. The other general category is that, even for a given individual, many problems have a '*hermaphrodite*' nature, with two opposite values for the given individual; in other words, while the individual suffers from the *existence* of the event, he/she will also suffer from the *elimination* of that same event (through the formation of some other causal links).

Problem-solving assigns no duties to human beings. Only by reference to human interests can remedy programs be justifiably imposed on the willing and the unwilling. Many people, quite often, refuse to accept problem-solving as a duty. Some people even feel that problem-solving is too individualistic to be pursued unashamedly –their loyalties are to teleological causes that focus on religious/national/class issues. (Actually, it is hard to contrast efforts to solve *your* problems with efforts to solve *other people's* problems. After all, altruistic causes may easily be redefined as efforts to solve the problems that *you have made yours*, even though you were not their original sufferer/victim.) Yet, those who are too miserable to afford self-denial (but not too miserable to afford hopes and effort) may find little help from their contemporaries. Despite thousands of years of healing practices, centuries of medicine, decades of psychological counseling and therapy, thousands of 'self-help' books, it has to be admitted that human beings are not optimally organized to help themselves or each other. While it would be unfair to deny the healing, counseling, therapy, etc. that does take place, it would be fatal to ignore the fact that the most powerful and the most menacing human organizations are still nation-states. When they find themselves in opposition to the (perceived or real) interests of their nation-state, healers and those who need healing have little choice but to retreat or surrender. Even those (few) religions that have supranational/'universal' doctrines have been effectively subdued and distorted by states all over this planet.

Some governments, now and then, declare that the interests of their citizens will be their first concern. But they soon realize that they cannot completely remold their own states (which have no choice but to exist and operate 'under fire'). Even the most generous welfare state cannot afford to make 'human' affairs its highest priority –it is an engine designed to serve in the antagonist combat, in international politics. Secondly, as in the case of some ecological issues, many common problems of humankind are beyond states' ability to solve. Thirdly, and what is most important for this study, not only do states fail to solve some of our most pressing problems (such as wars, rearmament, international economic conflict, population growth, environmental degradation, and pollution) but the 'normal' functioning of states generates such problems, and states cannot repair their damage by reforms, or even by internal political revolutions. The central descriptive thesis/diagnosis of my book is that states are responsible for the '*hermaphrodite*' nature of countless age-old and modern problems. As a result of the distortion due to interstatal relations, the solution of many problems and the elimination of some monstrous

threats appear to be (or actually *are*) serious problems and threats themselves. Thus, as long as that framework of distortion is perpetuated, political reforms and movements are doomed to substitute new problems and threats with the ones that they may eliminate.

I hypothesize that ‘interstatal antagonism’ is to be blamed for *many* instances of that kind of distortion of values (whereby solutions invite new threats, and human sacrifice is made necessary for ‘survival’). Interstatal antagonism, to summarize a longer definition, is a mode of relation in which 1) the parties acknowledge no limits to their interests, and do not refrain from using the military or economic power to decrease the power of each other; 2) one party's development/strengthening is a relative loss of status for the others –conversely, a party's loss of power is (deemed) a gain for the rest; 3) the parties try to hinder the growth/development of each other, while trying to improve their own status; 4) all parties form structures and channel much of the labor, mental-power, and material wealth of their citizens, taking for granted that external threats are ever-present in international relations; and 5) there is no ‘safe exit’ for any parties to the conflict (there are only the options of being occupied, and/or being vanquished). It so happens that most participants in the game of antagonism are ‘inherited’. Even though many people are recruited, or allowed to emigrate, the vast majority of the members of each state are inducted due to the citizenship of at least one of their parents.

Obviously, the way in which the citizens of a state sacrifice their time, energy, and wealth to do harm to other states, or to avoid harm from others is not necessarily a desirable process for the former. Therefore, it can be said offhand that the ‘rat race’ (the social obligation to work for a living), and all the other means and consequences of trying to harm others, while they are undeniable ‘problems’, become necessities, if not legal obligations. The servants of the state are not allowed to attempt to change or abolish the rat race –lest they threaten their own security. In antagonism, people create not only the necessary burdens of the game, but also a formidable obstacle to the solution or alleviation of countless serious problems. The combatant values, the status and the face of the states are to be safeguarded. Since many social reforms would inevitably entail a decrease in the states’ status as antagonists, they are to be squashed for reasons of national security. Antagonism also has a huge opportunity cost. Even if the functioning and ideology of antagonism do not prohibit and obstruct certain other allocations of human and material resources, forced investment in antagonism is investment denied to the truly needy.

Before giving some examples of problems ‘distorted’ in antagonist relations, I must say that the ones I study in Part 2 are too numerous to list here; besides, I have no claim to know all such problems. Also, not all the problems that I will mention here are equally necessitated by antagonist relations.

War (or the threat of war), however, is more than just necessitated by antagonism: It is a legitimate means for states to further their interests. In fact, it is the legitimacy of war that distinguishes antagonism from other conflicts of interest. As a result of preparation for war (be it defensive or offensive war-preparation), each country is *occupied*, as it were, *by its own national army*. In antagonist relations, the existence of external threats must be taken for granted (hence justifying military threats to potential enemies). At best, this means being forced to serve in the army, and/or pay for military expenses –at worst, it means that you make ‘the ultimate sacrifice’.

Dying or being wounded in war or in a ‘skirmish’ *may* be expected from citizens as a debt to their states that ‘protect’ them and provide many services to them. It is only *probable*,

because war is seldom resorted to; but that probability, by itself, is enough to justify the rat race (even though there are some other causes of the unchallenged prevalence of rat race on this planet). In other words, the state, whose strength as an antagonist depends partly on its economic power, forces its citizens to spend much of their lives in work –so much so that *mere subsistence* requires, in our industrialized age, more work than it required fifteen thousand years ago. While some of this inefficiency cannot be blamed on present nation-states, undeniably, there is state exploitation under any regime or economic system. Consequently, most citizens do not receive all the fruits of their labor. (At the same time, many receive far more than what, if any, they put in.) Some conscientious people who are yearning to do the ‘right thing’, such as taking care of one another and/or the environment find themselves economically, perhaps even legally, incapacitated to do so. The same states that reward unnecessary work and downright destructive work also set barriers to badly-needed ‘right work’...

Many problems facing humankind (like plagues, natural disasters, climate change, desertification, international terrorism, organized crime, etc.) deserve to be dealt with either on a global scale or on a scale far larger than nation-states. Although interstatal antagonism can accommodate, sometimes even necessitate, alliances of different kinds, the existing alliances prove incapable of addressing many such problems. On the other hand, many social problems can be solved only on a small scale. Partly because of the aforementioned ‘relativity’ of problems (i.e., that the elimination of what causes grievances to some people may cause intolerable grievances to some other people), social reconstruction and relocation of large numbers of people may be the best options. However, even the smallest state yokes together inharmonious people, and exposes them to preventable harm from each other. At the same time, even the most populous state segregates people who could potentially be in far greater harmony than seems to be attainable with their ‘inherited’ conationals.

Some other problems result from a society’s organization as an antagonist unit, and its functioning in a necessarily stratified structure. Some examples of such problems are inculcation of obedience to (state) power; repression of insurgencies and of separatist movements; policing, secrecy, lying, abuse of power by the rulers, and/or their lack of accountability for the blunders they cause; and the like.

Antagonism necessitates a decision-making body to function permanently. Therefore, the rulers are given the power to repress political actions that may lead to ‘chaos’ (i.e., vulnerability to attacks by other states, or at least loss of time in the construction of a new type of antagonist machine). However, as is well known, the rulers use their power *also* to safeguard their interests, *also* to repress movements, ways of life, ideas, etc. that they find intolerable from their own ideological perspectives. Not only military regimes, or the communist/theocratic party bureaucrats, or oligarchies of the rich, but almost every freely-elected government is involved in that kind of repression. What is repressed may even be new/different ways of life that certain groups try to create for themselves, without demanding changes in the larger society. As a result, certain religious sects, adherents to ‘preindustrial’ or ‘primitive’ modes of existence, homosexuals, nonviolent and nonparasitic drug-users, and some other ‘deviant’ groups are not allowed to create their own ways of life.

While the ideologies of the power elite render certain solutions impossible, states are responsible also for the existence and perpetuation of many great problems. Some states (still!) encourage population growth, and *all* states fail to deal with population problems effectively. With similarly irrational antagonistic ideologies, state educational programs try to inculcate

nationalistic values, loyalty, and patriotism. (Often, this involves attacks on the value systems of ethnic and religious minorities.) Familial and patriarchal values are almost universally cherished (also) by *governmental* organizations that punish those who challenge such values.

Some other problems, like environmental degradation, pollution, depletion of nonrenewable resources, etc., are created by economic combat; and even though they are too pressing to be brushed aside by rulers, they are beyond the nation states' capacity to solve or alleviate. Sadly, no international organization can help alleviate these problems, since any serious remedy program would entail a decrease in the pace of antagonist combat –which international organizations seem to be unable to control. While modern industry has been somewhat successfully utilized in furthering states' economic power, it is not the kind of savior that can save us from its own ill-effects; nor are we given the authority to tame it.

To sum up, citizens should not have high expectations concerning the elimination of the menacing social and environmental problems they suffer from, as long as the interstate antagonist game is continued. Since, by its nature, antagonism provides *no safe exit*, and since attempts at decreasing the tension of the 'tug-of-war' are bound to imply a pause, hence a possible fall, the harm-inflicting and (international) harm-preventing functions of states create new values and distort human values. Hoping that it does not sound fatalistic and moralistic, the case may be put this way: As long as your state is *against* some other human beings (who are also organized against you), it cannot be *for* you, in many instances; and since the values of the game are not exactly your own values, your part in the game is often against *you*.

Concerning the opportunity cost of antagonism, what individuals are kept from may be their existential/religious ideals, 'the meaning of life' as they define for themselves. The resources that antagonism exacts are so huge that there remains little freedom to live one's life in accordance only with one's own values. Antagonism consumes too much of the material resources and time necessary for the creation of a self/life which would not stimulate shame and pity at the moment of reevaluation as a person faces or contemplates death . . .

This study of antagonism deals primarily with the cost of antagonism to citizenry *during times of so-called peace* (with some awareness of the cost of antagonism to our planet). Still, I hope that the concluding picture of my treatise will be outrageous enough to mobilize some people against antagonism. I do not wish to underplay the likelihood of wars, or even of nuclear catastrophes. In fact, I consider the failure of antagonist governments to disprove the existence of such threats to be one of the major pieces of evidence proving that antagonism is an incredibly risky 'enterprise', and that no science or teleology can justify our forced contributions to it. Since it is so risky *and* systematically harmful, its *complete abolition* needs less scientific/moral justification than even the most modest 'piecemeal engineering'.

I acknowledge that the threat of war has a unique place in the present and potential 'cost' of antagonism. Therefore, the strategy that I propose as the first step in the abolition of antagonism is not a weeding out of alleged *roots* of antagonism, but the elimination of the material preconditions for its existence –namely, getting rid of *all weapons of mass-destruction and all armies*.

I contend that nothing less than *general and complete disarmament* is necessary for the abolition of the threat of war. Here I list, roughly, my proposals for the realization of that end. However, I do not imagine that, if these proposals are implemented, we will have perpetual peace in the state system. Rather, these proposals show what I suggest to be the *first step* toward

the abolition of nation-states, and the suppression of similarly antagonistic relations that may emerge among social formations that follow nation-states.

1. Those who recognize their moral duty should declare opposition to antagonism, accept their (potential) responsibility for what may befall humankind, define the nature of their present crimes, and suggest ways of changing the present course.

2. With the financial contribution of all states, a Global Disarmament Organization (GDO) should be established. (It may be reasonable to expect that the contributions of most states will be far below their present rearmament expenditures.) The decision-makers of GDO should include peace activists from nongovernmental campaigns, ethicists and religious leaders (possibly elected by the peoples of the world). The decision-makers should hire experts, consultants, and observers who are more knowledgeable about military and technological issues. Security experts of each state (previous diplomats, and the like) should be able to either choose or veto decision-makers or experts from their 'opponent' countries.

3. Within the stages determined by the experts, *all* military weapons should be neutralized, destroyed, or converted to peaceful use. Research on and the production of all destructive weapons should be stopped.

4. During the process of liquidation or conversion to peaceful use, all military weapons and raw materials necessary for weapons-production should be kept under the custody of GDO, with full authority to prevent proliferation of such weapons and raw materials.

5. All armed forces in the world should be demobilized, and all military organizations and institutions closed.

6. To prevent rearmament, GDO should continuously inspect all factories, etc., in the world that can be used for arms-production. GDO should train and appoint authorized observers, reward and protect whistle-blowers, and regularly inform the general public about matters of global and local security.

7. Scientists, workers, soldiers, and officials who were working in the military industry and military institutions should be paid adequately until reemployment (or until their share of reward or punishment is meted out).

8. Knowledge that can be used in arms-production should be censored and removed from all sources; those who have the know-how to re-produce weapons (especially nuclear weapons) should be separated from their state's control, and they should be isolated, in decent conditions, under GDO's supervision.

9. Extensive research should be conducted on pacifying agents (e.g., laughter gas, tear gas, tranquilizer darts, etc.) that can be used in suppressing large-scale violent acts without killing or mutilating anybody. These should replace the lethal weapons of the police, hunters, and civilians, with the ultimate goal of destroying all 'dumb' firearms in the world.

10. GDO should bring together an international peace force, which should intervene, using the pacifying agents mentioned above, whenever there are acts of violence and armed conflicts between nations or ethnic or religious groups, or any other groups. While the peace force should remain open to qualified volunteers, it should also hire some instructors who are qualified to train the troops in nonviolent strategies. Among the decision-makers of the peace force should be voluntary or paid pacifists. Under their leadership and watchful eyes, it may be temporarily advisable to rehire demobilized soldiers who had not committed violent crimes. Ethicists and clergy from different religious communities may also be asked to monitor and evaluate the actions of the peace force.

11. A supranational court of justice should be established with full authority to punish people (including presidents and governments) who try to provoke war or violence, or who try to rearm.

12. Each state, irrespective of its regime, should cede powers to *nongovernmental* organizations which can veto the government's aggressive attempts, and which are authorized to *overthrow* their respective governments in case they act against the requirements of peace.

General and complete disarmament, which operates also to prevent re-production of weapons and reconstitution of armies, goes further than any national 'alternative defense policy'. The fact that this set of proposals takes as its first target the nuclear powers themselves, and that it offers no tolerance to rearmament in any part of the globe makes it both difficult to realize and *more feasible* than other moderate/gradualist proposals. As long as it is made sufficiently clear that these proposals are not part of a game to advance the antagonistic agendas of any nation-states, and that they are intended as part of an irreversible process of abolishing antagonism altogether, it may be realistic to expect some collaboration from citizens of each state. By acknowledging the need for constant vigilance within every country, and by fully-authorizing the suppression of violence between organized societies, these proposals offer the promise of far greater security for humankind than the most threatening world-power could.

I focus on the *domestic* ill consequences of international politics. One reason for this is that I hope to make it easier for people to perceive the 'enemy' *inside* their own state, and not only 'up there' at the top of the political pyramid, but also in many aspects of their private, familial, and communal relations. In addition, I hope to have shown that antagonism is to be blamed not only on imperialism, or on expansionist states, or on the belligerent forces within each and every state, but that it is perpetuated by almost all 'productive' adults. It follows from this that, if antagonism is to be abolished, we must first abolish the official organizations of international harm. The first targets must be the most harmful products of our labor. In accordance with that sense of responsibility, taking back, neutralizing, or *sabotaging* the products of our own guilt should be perfectly justified. Clearly, 'undoing' may be complete only by ceasing to make new contributions. Therefore, *we should refuse to pay taxes, to do military service, to work in the war industry* (or the sector that makes the import of weapons possible), *to obey antagonist orders, and to pass them to subordinates*.

Even though this undoing is simply our *responsibility*, and not necessarily a political movement, states will most likely not tolerate it. Those who do not acknowledge their responsibility to abolish antagonism will have on their side an inherited fortified structure well equipped to repress pacifists. Irresponsible rulers and citizens will retain the power to make decisions affecting others' lives, including the power to bring them death and destruction—directly or indirectly. Therefore, whether or not state power is used against pacifists, the realization of global disarmament should bring with it some *punishment*. It is true that human antagonism has a past of several thousand years. Still, only a finite number of present-day living must be responsible for the perpetuation of antagonism in our time. In addition, since disarmament is the self-emancipation of citizens from their governments' and conationals' insanity, since it reverses a 'resource allocation' that placed humankind under threat, our victory should also bring some *rewards*.

Once the Global Disarmament Organization assumes its authorities, it should start implementing the following proposals for reward and punishment:

1. In order to punish those who actively oppose the peace movement, and similar movements that preceded it,

a) Those who violated the peacemakers' human rights, however high their position in the ruling pyramid, should be punished in accordance with a global peace law enacted by GDO;

b) Those who have used their official authorities against the cause of peace should be denied decision-making authority for the rest of their lives;

c) All who failed to use their official authority to protect and further the interests of their citizens/humankind, i.e., those who held political, military, or scientific authority, and yet refrained from taking active part in the cause of peace, should owe to peacemakers what they earned above subsistence level during their antagonist careers;

d) All citizens who contributed (in the form of taxes and/or work) to antagonist states, beyond a certain date (to be announced), should pay the opportunity cost of the delay that their contributions caused in the realization of global disarmament;

e) They should also continue to pay taxes to GDO *in excess of what they used to contribute to their states*, so that a total amount of money and work equal to previous defense expenditures can be collected.

2. In order to reward the peacemakers:

a) The revenues collected by GDO from antagonists should be reinvested for the purpose of creating a 'global security policy' that peacemakers will implement. The amount of money that remains –in the absence of a 'tug-of-war', global defense can be expected to cost less– should be delivered to individual peacemakers (until all antagonists get too old to work). The share of each peacemaker should be calculated by considering his/her date of joining the movement, and the nature and scope of his/her services in it. (Individual peacemakers may or may not donate their shares to charity, or to organizations trying to achieve further social reforms.)

b) Peacemakers should have the usufruct of all materials that had belonged to armies, and which GDO finds necessary to convert to peaceful use. Hence, satellites, military bases, battleships, aircraft, military buildings, military vehicles, various military equipment, uniforms, etc., can be sold to bring dividends to peacemakers.

The implementation of these proposals may provide incentives for citizens of all states to continue to keep their states from aggression. It may also help the masses realize that their interests did not have to be connected to antagonist policies. Incorporating such proposals for reward and punishment into the demands/objectives of peace activists is likely to enhance necessary linkages. Undeniably, there are many other social causes that also demand urgent solutions. So far, I argued that complete disarmament, and eventually the liquidation of states must be the *first step* in solving the many problems that I hypothesize to be 'distorted' by antagonism. Once that is generally agreed upon, it would be unjust to form an obstacle to other social causes. I hope it is clear that the rewards inherent in the proposed strategy for peace can provide the funds (and some more important nonmaterial gains) necessary for such causes and philanthropic organizations. (On the other hand, those who give priority to other causes without ceasing to contribute to antagonism must find a justification for their irresponsibility.)

If I expect some of those who have been keeping their distance from the cause of peace to join, and in fact to create such a demanding peace movement, despite state oppression, that is not merely because I imagine that they will be motivated by the possibility of rewards, and/or that they will be mindful of the possibility of punishment. In some states (more developed and

less developed alike) citizens have to take too great risks. And they have more, much more to lose than their chains. That is one reason why the promise of peace alone may not be enough even to achieve (or maintain) peace itself.

In my book, I do not start from a single-minded dedication to peace. Nor do I start from a broad dedication to something like ‘nonstop problem-solving on a global scale’. I have to note that, chronologically, some general ‘remedy proposals’ occurred to me before the conceptualization and the methodology of the science of problem-solving. Still, I believe that Part 1 of the book is useful for those who may adhere to vastly different views on diagnoses, prognoses, or remedy proposals. Whether or not anybody else chooses to do the same, I have staked my remedy proposals and diagnoses on the scientific standards that I have sought to establish in Part 1 of the book.

My general observations concerning the nation-state system and the plight of individuals living under it do not qualify as serious diagnoses. Even truly elaborate and accurate diagnoses would be meaningful only for those human beings who were studied, not for billions of others. Still, international antagonism being a monstrous *fait accompli*, the burden of proof is not on those who find themselves suffering from it. Since I tried to deal mainly with *domestic consequences of antagonistic policies in ‘peacetime’*, deliberately excluding scenarios of nuclear wars, or examples of abuse of power, corruption, ‘freak accidents’ (especially of a nuclear and ecological nature), my depiction of the antagonistic state system may be inexcusably lenient. After all, for those who consider it fundamentally immoral to organize against the interests of other human beings, to arm and threaten them with war and destruction, many of the diagnostic observations in the book can at best be scientifically illuminating. They certainly do not need me to condemn antagonism. I can only hope that, despite my caution/conservatism in critical assessment, my verdict on antagonism is as unforgiving as theirs.

The remedy proposals in Part 3 of the book try to address the problems studied in Part 2. However, they, too, cannot be completely justified on the scientific basis that I tried to establish. Besides, some of them are meant to deal with problems that are not studied in the context of antagonism; and some are offered in anticipation of problems that may emerge once the state system is abolished. Even before starting the book, I believed that it was necessary to make a good case for the possibility that many different ways of human life (as long as they are harmless to each other and/or to the environment) can coexist on this planet. Without such a vision of accommodating far more diversity than is presently allowed, it may be impossible to motivate people who are presently organized against each other to oppose their own states, risking their lives in the process.

The following is an abbreviated list of my proposals for building a social framework within which countless different ways of life can be realized. While these proposals occupy a small part in this summary, they take up the largest part of my book. At my own risk, I want to use below an invented auxiliary verb, ‘yuud’, instead of ‘should’, trying to make clear that the following imply proposals and no dogmatic obligation or categorical imperative. (Yuud rhymes with would and should. The ‘should’ statements used for the proposals for disarmament also need to be read as ‘yuud’ statements.)

1. (In addition to the realization of general and complete disarmament) Economic and other antagonistic relations between states, and between the social organizations to follow them, yuud be prevented. That is, all forms of intersocietal aggression and exploitation yuud be prohibited. Even economic competition yuud be permitted only between groups that had

approved that mode of relation beforehand, and groups for which the freedom of an exit is secured.

2. All existing nation-states yuud be dissolved. The function of preventing various forms of harmful relationships (and, related to that, legislation, taking precautions, interfering in cases of conflicts) yuud be fulfilled by a global organization. That organization yuud be constituted by various independent councils dealing with specific sets of harmful relationships (such as aggression, exploitation, offenses against others' way of life, harm to children and the unconscious, harm to the environment, etc.).

3. Global equality of opportunity yuud be achieved concerning both material resources (including places of settlement and environmental resources) and some immaterial resources such as knowledge and 'education'. An entirely new artificial language yuud be created, with the collaboration of scholars from all continents, and it yuud be mandated for the (re)training of adults and nonadults. As much as possible, young children yuud be taught at least three languages, one of them being this new language (the Language of Humankind). The same program of global equality yuud aim at making amends to the previously underprivileged, with the purpose of retroactive compensation. Once equality of opportunity is realized, inheritance yuud be abolished, so as to preserve equity.

4. In order both to make the aforementioned equality program *feasible*, in the first place, and to remove/lessen the profitability of plundering/exploitation as a way of improving a social group's wealth and power, (and with a number of other justifications) *human procreation yuud be prohibited* until the global human population, through natural deaths, decreases to a level at which, despite the scarcity of resources and the deteriorating environmental conditions, affluence can be realized for everybody. In fact, at that level of civilization, most human beings may be able to afford both affluence and compassion...

5. Circumscribed only by harm-preventing regulations, adults yuud be free to form independent, entirely voluntary (all-adult) social units, and to determine the laws and the value systems of their groups. All ways of life which do not involve harming other human beings (or the vital ecosystems) yuud be protected, no matter how intolerable they may seem to nonmembers elsewhere. Such internally independent political units ('parlenays', as I call them) yuud have only temporary right to the places where they settle, and, in order to achieve equality in an overpopulated world, they yuud take turns at settlement.

6. With the purpose of realizing equality of opportunity, and actual 'freedom of choice' of individuals (and also in accordance with the second major function of science –that of eliminating the conditions that force us to act upon insufficient knowledge) religious, nationalistic, and even career-oriented education of nonadults yuud be prohibited. Children yuud be freed from the expectation to inherit and perpetuate the value systems of the social groups that they are born into; in fact, they yuud not be allowed as *members* into the parlenays. In other words, the global harm-preventing organization yuud try to abolish, after the abolition of antagonism, all imposition *on nonadults* of societal and religious duties that are not based on (this-worldly) human interests.

7. After some forty years (or even longer) of effective prohibition of human procreation, when the birth control program is abrogated, it yuud be compulsory to supply, or guarantee the free availability of, *all* the (conventionally-determined) basic needs of each child *before* giving birth to it. That way, each and every child conceived after the successful completion of the birth control program may be expected to be emancipated from the *condemnation* to work for his/her

own subsistence (while people who decide to procreate, and those who support them, are required to provide the total basic needs of their children).

I expect the above remedy proposal to decrease (and, in less than two generations, put a stop to) economic or social obligation to work. In addition to the age-old need to hunt (for those who are not opposed to it), gather, fish, and forage, there will be only voluntary work (or work for the purpose of compensating for one's mistakes and crimes). If one feels exploited (and if one is concerned about that) one can really escape it. Likewise, one can change careers and locations for reasons of health or pleasure. Preguaranteed subsistence is intended also as a safeguard against people being coerced into relations harmful to others (as well as a shield against unintended harm from others).

Clearly, the above proposal promises to save only the generations that will be brought to the world after the abrogation of the birth control program. As for the generations that will not be able to emancipate themselves from compulsory work by the birth control program, the redistribution program *yuud* entail a nonthreatening share of the earth's resources by 'capitalist' and 'socialist' economies, *and* by other economic systems. Even small societies that want to have trade relations only with people who share their faith, or political/ideological/environmental concerns *yuud* have adequate access to resources that they need for economic independence and self-sufficiency. No general law *yuud* interfere with the way in which power, status, or wealth is distributed in each *parlenay*, as long as *parlenays* are effectively kept from penetrating into the economies of societies that have not consented to trade.

8. The decline of the *Homo sapiens* population will also aid the gradual recovery of endangered ecosystems. Throughout the eight decades when the human population will remain in the billions, 'greener' alternatives that are shown to be scientifically or technologically feasible *yuud* be made mandatory and/or subsidized in order to minimize pollution and destruction of other forms of life. Environmental laws *yuud* limit and control the production processes in all industries. In addition, as human nutritional needs are met and exceeded, more and more land *yuud* be converted from agricultural and industrial use, and prepared for wildlife by means of an 'environmental repair industry'.

All the above are, obviously, very bald proposals, if not totally unrealistic ones. However, I argue that all these bold remedy programs will buttress each other. If I expect each of these proposed programs to be both feasible and fruitful, it is because I expect the rest of the programs to alleviate its possible unintended consequences, and/or to provide alternative benefits for those whose interests are likely to be negatively affected by it.

I started working on the book in 1980. Much of the book was written during the years when the two major blocs appeared to be trying to outpace each other in terms of their nuclear weapons technologies. Still, I must confess that I was motivated more by the hope that the nation-state system and the international antagonist relations can be abolished, and many different ways of life can be realized, than by a justifiable fear of nuclear catastrophes. The title of the book suggests not that we are on the threshold of a nuclear (or other) catastrophe, nor that we are on the threshold of a historically-determined revolution to eradicate all social evils, but that we may be on the threshold of creating, independently of any overarching establishments and ideologies, social formations in which we can take our own risks in pursuing the positive (happiness-increasing) and negative (problem-solving) ends of social life.

Permanence in peace can (justifiably) be expected only if people seeking different ways of life are given the freedom, as well as some of the essential resources, to pursue their goals

with minimal compromise and sacrifice. Unless we can provide a clear legal and practical framework within which such ‘peaceful coexistence’ appears to be feasible, we may not garner sufficient support for disarmament, the very first step in the emancipation of human beings from being each other’s enemies. I do not think that there is any theoretical difficulty in incorporating the struggle to achieve freedom from *death* in wars into the wider set of endeavors to *live* as one wishes to. Neither do I think there should be any difficulty in persuading peace activists that if their *survival* is worth the struggle, *improving their lives* must also be worth struggling for.

Recognizing the unique (inexpressible) dearness of our lives, and disregarding the establishments and insane games that try to dictate unbearable roles (if not death and destruction) as our fate, and perceiving the absurdity and misery of the way we lived so far under antagonism must be helpful in fathoming how great a crime it would be to die, as murderers of human beings on the ‘other side’ and of ourselves, responsible for having rendered life miserable/impossible for our neighbors and ourselves . . . What millions upon millions, in cowardice and learned helplessness are unable to see is not just how near peace may be, if they struggle for it, but also how near their (and our!) *lives* may be, if they shoulder the awesome responsibilities to choose/create their own ways to live.

Anseynol